

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT COUNTIES

Advisory Meeting Teleconference

March 9, 2004

Summary

The meeting convened at 9:30 a.m, and ended at 11:45 a.m.

Participants: Representatives from the 19 Performance Measurement (PMC) Counties
California Department of Social Services (CDSS) Staff:
Joeana Carpenter, Hector Hernandez, Michael Bowman-Jones,
Ed Flores, Pete Flores, Leanna Pace, Jerry Parker, Richard Terwilliger, and
Richard Trujillo

Joeana Carpenter initiated the role call for this meeting; a representative from all of the PMC counties was in attendance. Leanna provided a cursory review of the agenda, and opened the meeting.

Joeana provided a summary review of the last PMC meeting.

CalWIN Counties Preparedness for Conversion

Leanna requested that the counties begin preparation for converting to CalWIN system. The counties were informed that they should begin to determine the necessary measures to ensure a smooth transition to this system with little or no impact on their error rates. Leanna informed the committee that consideration should be given to both pre-conversion procedures (data scrubbing), and post-conversion (second party case reviews) procedures. The counties were also informed that CDSS would be sending them a letter specifying procedures that will assist them in the conversion process.

Case Review Process

Hector Hernandez shared that a CDSS analyst will be assigned to each county. He also informed the counties that reviews will begin Mid-March beginning with drop cases, and that active/error cases will be reviewed towards the end of March. Hector informed the counties that all disposition reports are to be sent to Ron Morgan of his staff. He also informed the counties that they may contact their CDSS consultant to discuss cases prior to submission, but that his staff must have the review case three days prior to the date it will be transmitted to FNS. He stated that this is especially critical for cases that remain a #3, and are being transmitted at the end of the review period.

Proposed Regional Training Forums for PMCs

Hector Hernandez informed the counties that CDSS is requesting that the United States Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Services (FNS), provide State Exchange Project (SEP) funds for the purpose of conducting three, ideally four, regional payment accuracy training forums. He asked the counties to be thinking about the topics they would like to be included in the forums, to formulate a committee to work on the forums, and to consider the use of county facilities for the regional forums. This item will be further discussed at the next PMC meeting.

Summary Food Stamp Federal Differences

Hector Hernandez informed the committee that there are no additional federal differences. On March 2, 2004, CDSS appealed the previously discussed drop case with the FNS because it is CDSS' opinion that this was a technical error. Also, there was an \$84.00 overissuance error what was appealed to Dennis Stewart, Dave Bailey, and to Lisa Kim. Subsequently FNS sent CDSS a letter upholding the error.

Quarterly Reporting Procedures

Richard Trujillo indicated that he did not receive any comments on the QC quarterly reporting draft procedures. The draft procedures, particularly as outlined in draft 2, would be the final procedures. Richard indicated that until the final procedures are approved, the draft procedures that were developed in the October 2003 will be the procedures that counties are to follow, and used as the basis for quality control appeals until the procedures are final.

Fresno had a question regarding voluntary mid quarter report information submitted in the QR 7. Their concern was that the report completed for February (the data month), submitted in March (the submit month), contains information for the submit month which affects the allotment for the submit month as well as the QR payment quarter. The committee was instructed to use the February information to determine the allotment for the next quarter as required by the ACL, and to review to the March information as well. However, Fresno feels that the information for March should not be acted upon, because it falls outside of the QR-7 data month report. Oralia will email questions to Richard who will then forward them to CDSS' FSP Policy Bureau for a response. Vienna and Rob will also write questions, and send them to Richard for response. Responses to all questions will be emailed to the counties.

TANF

Richard Trujillo said that Warren Ghens revised the instructions on Inter-County Transfer (ICT) for TANF data collection cases and issued them via the user group February 5, 2003.

Joeana Carpenter shared information regarding the TANF Special Pull. They are ongoing cases that are late updates to the MEDS file from which the sample is selected. These cases were not put on MEDS until sometime in mid month. Therefore, much like the secondary cases, a another sample must be taken to ensure that all cases have a chance to be selected for case data collection. There are 21 cases statewide that are selected each month, 11 of them are from Los Angeles county.

TANF Time-Limit Training. The PMC supervisors said the conference call training on Time-Limits was helpful. The teleconferencing aspect of the training enabled them to allow more staff to participate in the training at no additional cost.

Transitional Food Stamps (TFS)

Richard Trujillo indicated that questions regarding TFS were sent to FNS. The supervisors asked for a copy of the questions. He will send out the copies via the users egrou. Richard will also forward FNS's response as soon as he receives them.

Reconciling the Food Stamp Disposition Report Process

Richard Trujillo reiterated the process for reconciling the disposition report. He said that he emailed the reminder via the users egrou. He emphasized that any "Case Revision Request

Form” that has been submitted to the Data Transmission Validation Unit (DTVU) must be included as part of the reconciling process.

Regional Reports

None.

Other

Committee members requested that the PMC meetings alternate between Sacramento and Southern California. This issue will be discussed at the Regional Meeting, and their recommendation will be shared at the next PMC Meeting.

Committee members appreciated receiving the Q5 updates because county staff can read them for themselves. Oralia said the arbitration notices were also helpful as they provided information on other states facing the same issues especially in addressing sanction defense as it seems that other states are held harmless where California is being held accountable. *However*, the committee expressed differing perspectives as to whether California was being reviewed with stricter review standards.

Several counties did not receive CDSS’ May 2004 CAP update request that was emailed to the counties on February 6, 2004. As requested by the committee, future CAP update requests will also be emailed and mailed to the PMC committee members. Leanna re-emailed the CAP format and cover letter to Fresno and Solano County PMC members.

The committee members were polled, and all stated they prefer the teleconference verses traveling to Sacramento for the PMC, but requested that the travel option be held open and used as necessary.

Next PMC Meeting

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m. The next meeting will be held on April 13, 2003, and will also be a teleconference meeting.